Previous references.

1900-01.
(S & A.)

File No. 36 ~~00~~.

Serial Nos. 1-13.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 - 13.

Part B. for

S & A 36 - 00

Pension to R Rama Rao, Peishkar, Imperial Service Regiment.

From R Rama Rao Pet. Dated 9th Oct 00

Prays for the early sanction ~~f~~ his pension

To ~~the Govt~~ No. 5745 / P & A 573 Dated 26th Oct 00

~~States that his petition has been forwarded~~ to the Comptroller for favour of early disposal

From the Comptroller No. 3044 Dated 26th Nov 00

Requests order of Govt with regard to the services of Rama Rao who has served partly in the inferior and partly in the superior service

The Comptroller, Chief Commandant

No. 36II - 2 / P & A 556 Dated 4th Jan 01

Directs him to treat the case on the analogy of employees in the Civil Dept. and to apply Art 258 of the M S R.

5 From Rama Rao Pet. Dated 23rd Feb 01

Points out precedents in which the whole service was treated as superor and requests that the same favour be shown to him

6 From the Comptroller

No. 4II4 / 642 Dated 27th Mar 01

Forwards duly verified the pension application of Rama Rao for the orders of Govt

7 To the same and Chief Commandant

No. I4329 - 30 / P & A I346 Dated 25th Apr 01

Sanctions a gratuity of Rs I69 and a pension of Rs 2(9-I3- I0) with effect from the 7th Sept 00

8 To the Comptroller No. I230 / P & A 67

Dated 24th Jul 01

with ref. to the above requests him to state how the present

case differs from the precedents refferred to by the petitioner

9 From Rama Rao Pet. Dated 5th Dec 01

Appeals against orders of the Military Assistt

I0 From the Comptroller

No. 5I26 / 463 Dated 8th Feb 02

States that the present case does not differ from the precedents (With ref to Sl 8)

II To the Chief Commandant

No. I6I68 / P & A II38 Dated Ist Apr 02

Requests his opinion with regard to the treatment of the services of Silledars

I2 From the same No. 387 Dated I4th Aug 02

States instances in which the services were treated as superior

I3 To Rama Rao

No. 9073 / P & A 637 Dated 27th Nov 02

With ref. to his petition states that the orders already passed are final

For Order

Office Note

Vide Petn No 2914 - from Pensioner Peishkar Rama

Rama Row entered on service as a Sawar on 6th August 1869. He was promoted as Peshkar on 1st July 1883. On 5th Sept/99 he was retired in consequence of a reduction in the strength of the Regiment. Thus out of a total service of 30 years and 1 month, Yrs m ds 13-10-25 were as Sawar & 16-2-4 as Peshkar.

In forwarding to the Comptroller his application for pension the Chief Commandant recommended a pension calculated on the pay drawn as Peshkar.

3. The Comptroller in his letter No. 3044 of 19th Nov/00 observed that as the pension to Sawars is regulated by the Special Rules prescribed for the Military Force, and that of Peshkars by the rules applicable to Civil Establishments, there was no provision

in the Regulations
~~existed~~ for a case in which
service is partly of a lower
and partly of a Superior.
The Comptroller further observed
that the amount of pension
fixed for lowers is almost
equal to that prescribed
for Inferior Servants in the
Civil Ests: where an Officer
whose service has been
partly inferior and partly
Superior is allowed the
option of counting the
whole as Inferior towards
pension or gratuity on
the Inferior Scale, or the
Superior pension towards
pension or gratuity on
the Superior Scale and
the inferior pension
towards gratuity on the
Inferior Scale, and was
of opinion that under
that analogy Rama Row
was entitled to an Inferior gratuity
for his Service as Lower
and to a Superior pension
for

for service as Peshkar
& Govt: in their order
No: 8611-12 dated 4-1-01
PWA 853
concurred in the opinion
of the Comptroller and
directed Rama Rao's case
being reported on according
5. Rama Rao having learnt
the tenor of this Govt: order
addressed a petition
(Regd: No: 1709) of 23-2-01
to Govt: stating that he was
abruptly retired although still
able to work not being de-
clared unfit by the
Medical Officer, that
he hears he is to get a
gratuity for his service
as Sowar and a pension
for his service as Peshkar
whereas in the previous
cases of E. Gurumurthy and
Annaji Rao, who like
himself served in both
capacities (of Silledar &
of Peshkar) superior half
pay pension was granted,
and praying for similar
better treatment of his case

Ref: Govt. Order No. 353-9 dt. 13/4/1906

the precedents quoted by him are in his favour, for the services in those cases which have been exactly similar have been treated as superior in calculating pension.

5 In compliance with the Govt: Order referred to in para 4 above viz: No: 8611-12 / PTA 855 dated 4 January 01 the Comptroller in his No: 4114 / PTA 642 of 23-3-01 submitted for sanction duly verified & reported on the pension application of the Petitioner Ramaswamy, recommending him for an Inferior Gratuity of Rs. 169 and a Superior Compensation pension of Rs. 9-13-10 - Sanction was accorded by Govt: order No: 14329-3 / PTA 1346 dated 25 April 01.

Ramaswamy now submits a Memorial to the Dewan & the Councillors setting forth his grievances as already stated, and praying for a Superior pension of Rs. 18-8-- besides a bonus of half pay

Regd No: 2914 of 26/6/01

2/3

3 months pay as recommended by the Chief Commandant or for reinstatement as Peshkar.

Submitted for orders to Secty.

19/7/07 Rama Rao's petition may now be forwarded to the Comptroller for report as to how his case differs from those of C. Srinivasa Rao and Annaji Rao for whom pensions were ~~sanctioned~~ calculated by him for the Entire Service and sanctioned in Govt. Pro: No 353-4 dt 6 10th April 1886. The original Pension Rolls may also be forwarded for reference & return.

20/7/1907

Yes. 20/7

Subd with Offs

21/7/07

Submitted.

The Comptroller to whom

whom the above order was communicated in this office Docket No. 1230 dated 24th July/87 PWA 67 states in reply that the Petitioner Rama Row's case did not differ from those of Peishcar Srinivasa Rao and Annaji Row, which were reported on by his office in March/86, but that his office having at the time of dealing with the case of the Petitioner felt a doubt as to passing a superior pension for the whole service instead of Inferior gratuity for the Inferior portion and Superior pension for the superior portion of service, a reference was made to Govt. who concurred in the views expressed by his office and passed orders accordingly in Govt. No. 8611-12/855 of 4-1-01. Viz that Rama Row was entitled to an Inferior gratuity for his service as Sowar and to a Superior pension for service as Peishcar.

The Comptroller adds that a copy of the said reference to Govt. was at the same time forwarded to the Chief

(7)

Chief Commandant who made no protest against the proposed alteration in the method of computing pension for Sowar Forces.

Submitted for orders of Secty.

7/3/02

Though the Petitioners case is analogous to that of A Srinivasa Rao & Annaji Rao whose services as Silledars were reckoned as superior and who were granted Superior Compensation & pensions (Vide Pro: No 353-4 of 10th April 1886 so far back as 1886, put up), the former seems to have been treated differently from those of the latter as will be seen from the final orders passed in his case in Pro: No 8611-12 P&C 855 of 4th January 1901.

It is however a point for consideration how the Petitioner's case could

now be reconsidered without creating an inconvenient precedent.

AB

9/3/1902

The pensions quoted as precedents were sanctioned in 1886. Apparently the question was not raised then. But it was raised specifically in the Petrie Case (1901) and decided against him.

Though there was something to be said on the other side before the Act was passed, it is difficult to adduce any sufficient reason to reconsider it now.

Submitted to the 3rd Councillor - AH

13/3/1902

13.3.02
(108)

(9)

[illegible] to the usual letters
[illegible] in the usual
[illegible] in my handwriting
[illegible] changes
[illegible] first-two cases
[illegible] reference
[illegible] my dispensing
[illegible] Pollen Examiner
[illegible] my dispensing
[illegible] my/90 and the
[illegible] two my/86.

10/3

8/3 1/-

Subject. There are no reports here giving the above information. But the Comptroller says in the last para of his letter No. 5126/463 d. 4/2/02 that he informed the Chief Commandant of the proposed alterations in the method of computing pension for warrant officers but received no protest from him against it. A draft letter to the Ch: Commandant calling for the information required is submitted for appl.

DNR 2873/02

(11)

(1) Peishkar Seshrao
(2) Surpeishkar Hanumanta Rao
(3) —do— A. Srinivasa Row
(4) ~~—do—~~ Peishkar Annaji Rao.

Papers Nos (1) & 2 are not forthcoming
& those Nos (3) & 4 are in file A

The Chief Commandant who was written to, reports that there is no express rule governing the classification of the Services of Silledars, but that in the case of the marginally noted instances (which were decided in 1886), the service rendered as Silledar was treated as superior (their pay being above Rs 10/-) and that this practice of treating the Silledars' Service as Superior did not undergo any modifications until the case of the Peishkar Rama Row in question was decided by Govt in 1901.

Subs proceeds to Secy:

DMB
30/8/02

JJ
6/9/1902

Draft an order giving the benefit of the precedents to this case and submit for approval & thro Dewan thro Secy Councillor.

JJ

24/9

Draft subs:-
gnp
25-4-02

JJ
8/10

(Signed) Mis. 61
4-10-02

R Mis 7-10-02
6454

2nd Councillor's order

" I am not sure that "
" we should now deal "
" with this case on "
" the analogy of certain "
" cases disposed of some "
" 16 years ago - Under the "
" rules, the petitioner has "
" no grievances. In spite "
" of the observation — "
" proposed to be made "
" in this draft, there "
" would be the same "
" difficulty in future "
" similar cases. I am "
" for declining to reopen "
" the case. I am however "
" willing to abide by "
" the Deputy's decision "

(Sd) C. S
4-10-02

Deputy's order

Read

1902

(18)

Read

Petition Reg: No 2914 dt 26th June 1901 from Rama Rao late Peishcar in the Imperial Service Regiment of the Mysore Horse praying that his service as Silledar may be treated as superior and an enhanced pension sanctioned to him in lieu of the pension and gratuity sanctioned in Govt Pro No 14329-30 / PAR. 1346 dt 25th April 1901.

(13)

I am not sure that we should now deal with this case on the analogy of certain cases disposed of some years ago - Under the Rules the Petitioner has no grievance - In spite of the observations proposed to be made on this draft, I have passed the same difficulty in putting similar cases - I am for declining to reopen the case - I am however willing to be guided by the Members decision -

4/10/02

Rama Rao entered Govt service as Silledar on the 6th August 1869, was appointed Peishcar on the 1st July 1883 and was finally retired from service on the 4th Sep. 1899. Thus he has rendered a service of

Issued 7935
Send C. C. 5
Letter to comptroller
to call his opinion
24/10
22.X.02

of 13-10-26 as Silledar and 16-2-4 as Peishcar. The complaints, under the orders of Govt conveyed in Govt Pro No 8611-12 dy 4th Jan 1901, tended his service as Silledar as Inferior and recommended a gratuity for his service as Silledar and a superior pension for his service as Peishcar which was sanctioned in Govt Pro No 14329-30 dy 25th April 1901. The petitioner now prays that his service as Silledar may be treated as superior as was done in the case of Peishcar A. Srinivasa Rao and Peishcar Anniji Rao. Taking his long service into consideration and having regard to the

fact that the precedents cited are in his favour, the Govt are pleased to direct that the service of Rama Rao as Silledar be regarded as a special case as superior, the principle laid down in Govt Pro No 8611-12 Pat. 855 dt 4th Jan. 1901 being held applicable to all similar cases in future.

2. The pension application of Rama Rao is herewith forwarded to the Govt of Mysore for favour of a fresh report.

Dft

Secretary

mp.
25-9-02

27/9/1902

To

The Comptr with pension application of Rama Rao

The Military Asst to the Govt of Mysore

15

X Serial 1044.

(19)

To The Comptroller to
the Govt of Mysore

No

Dy. Aug 8th 1902.

(16)

In forwarding herewith
copy of
letter No 307 d: 12th
August 1902 from the
Chief Commandant
Mysore State Troops,
has the honor to request
that the Comptroller
will be good enough
to favour Govt
with his opinion
thereon

B. O.

Draft.

Secretary

DWB
27/10/02

JPB
28/10

"Send c.c's letter to
"-comptroller and ask
"his opinion"

(Sd) P.N.K.

"Issue"
Sd H.V.P.
24-10-02

22-10-02

(17)

Sub2

A draft docket to the comptroller as ~~th~~ per the Demans order is Sub2. In this connection it is submitted that the comptroller has expressed his opinion on the subject in his letter No 5126/463 d: 4th Feby 1902 (S1 No 14) though not exactly on the ship commandants' letter but on the petition of Rama Row which was forwarded by him.

PVR
27/10/02

~~Comptroller's opinion~~
~~Comptroller~~

Subd to Secretary.

Please see the comptroller's letters Serial Nos 3 & 14 in which that ~~Comptroller's~~

Officer's opinion is given.
I doubt if the Comptroller
has anything more to say
on the subject, except leaving
the matter for the orders
of Govt. Draft prepared as
per Dewan's order is however
submitted. [illegible]
28/10/1902

When you suggest a modn, you
should give a clearer opinion.
What does the Compr exactly say
on the question? Please mark the
refces he makes in his letter
~~Encl~~ (Sl 14) and put refce marks.

11/4

Subj:
In letter No 387 dt: 12th × Sl No 17
August 1902, the Chief
Commandant states, quoting
instances,
(1) that there have been
a few precedents of
the

the Services of silledars being treated as "Superior"

(ii) that this practice had not undergone any changes until Peishcar Rama Row's case in question was decided in 1901

and

(iii) that there is no express rule on the Subject.

In letter No.× 5126/463 d: 4th Febuary 1902, the Comptroller has stated that Peishcar Rama Row's case does not differ from ~~the precedents quoted by the Chief Commandant~~ those× of peishcars Annaji Rao and Srini vas Row, but that he, however feeling a doubt at the time of dealing with the case of peishcar Rama Row in question, referred the

(17)

× Sl. No. 14

× precedents quoted by the Ch: Commandant in the above letter (Sl. No. 17)

the matter ~~question~~ to Govt for
order, who concurring
with his views, treated
the Sirdar Service as
"Inferior" and passed
orders accordingly. He × Serial No 4.
further asked that he
forwarded a copy of
his letter to Govt to the
ship Commander, who
made no protest against
the proposed alteration
in the method of computing
pension for Sirdar forces on the inferior scale.
From ~~this and~~ this and
from para 2 of his letter × Sl No 3
No 3044 d: 19th Nov
1900, it is apparent that
the Comptroller accepts
that there is no express
rule on the subject, & that on his representation
~~that the services of~~ Govt directed in Serial
Sirdars were treated No 4 that the Service of
as "Inferior" and that Sirdars should be treated
the alteration was first as inferior.
introduced only in the
~~Cape of Rs Rumaker~~.

Sir

× Sl No 3

In para 3 of his letter No 3044 dated 19th November 1900, the Comptroller has addduced his grounds for treating Lyth Service as inferior. ~~also in favour of the proposed alteration.~~ It seems therefore that the Comptroller will have nothing more to say on the subject.

(21)

WB 14/11/02

JB 15/11/1902

If the whole service in this case has to be treated ~~differently~~ as Superior, S.O. Serial 4 has to be altered. The Comptroller has already given his opinion that as Savars get nearly the same pension as inferior Servants in Civil employ, the Savar service should be treated as 'inferior'. If the Govt chooses to say that Savar service in such cases, should be treated as Superior, as far as I see the Compt^r can have nothing to say. I also

doubt whether there is any need to refer again to the Order is solicited in the matter.

17/11

The Secretary.

7289
2017 11 02

Please adhere to the order of the 4th January 1901 which is also the decision of the II Commission

18.XI.02

29/11

Draft submitted
Rip
21.11.02

Pol A. 654.

1900 4314.
18.10.00.

No. 602 (1) Sl. 59

Name of Petitioner R. Ramaiah Row

Village } Pensioned Peshkar
Taluk } Hunsredypalyam
District } Bangalore.

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 9-10-00

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

Transferred to the P & A Branch
17.10.00.

17/10/00

R 18/10/00.

Sent 20-10-00.

(1)

ABSTRACT

States that he is a retired peshkar of the Imperial Service and was retired in the last year - that he has addressed the Comptr through the Chief Comm ant for the grant of a pension without any re - finds it difficult to maintain his big family of 13 souls in these hard times of famine and plag Prays for the speedy grant of his pension.

10/10

Today 23/10/00 (2)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

~~Petition~~ Pte Branch.

~~Petition~~ Department.

5745 of 26-10-00

Sl (2) for 593 Dwr

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 602 dated 28th Sept 1900 received at the Dewan's Office from R. Rama Rao, Retired Peshkar of the Mysore Imperial Service Lancers praying for the grant of an anticipatory pension — is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosure~~, to the Comptroller to Govt of Mysore for favour of early disposal.

(2)

By order,

Sept

Bangalore, } for Secretary.

Sept 1900 ~~189~~ }

23/10/00

Ora. 833

DEPARTMENT

(3)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN C
5847
20.XI.00.

From

THE COMPTROLLER,
MYSORE GOVT.

730

To

THE SECY. TO GOVT. OF MYSORE,
Rev & Genl Dept.

(3)

Dated 19th

Despatched 23rd Novr 1900

Received 26th

No. 3044

No. ...

Sl (3)

SUBJECT MATTER.

Requesting to return the
papers of Govt regarding the
services of M. Ramakrishna
Rao who has served partly
as Sheristadar & partly as
Peishkar &c.

Recd 28/11/00.

Returned
Copy
12/12/00.

SPECIAL AUDIT DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE OF THE

COMPTROLLER, GOVT. OF MYSORE,

BANGALORE, 19th. November 1900

From

E. R. SUBRAYER, ESQ.,

COMPTROLLER, GOVT. OF MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,

General and Revenue DEPT.

(4)

SIR,

In forwarding herewith the pension application of Peishkar Rama Rao received from the Chief Commandant, I have the honor to state that the applicant has served partly as silladar and partly as peishkar and that a pension calculated on the pay drawn as peishkar has been recommended by the Chief Commandant for both the combined services.

Pension to sowars is regulated by the special rules prescribed for the Military Force, and that of Peishkars by the rules applicable to Civil Establishments -vide Government Pro: No.1230-31/94 dated 4th. January 1900- but it is not defined in this order or in the Mysore Service Regulations as to what amount of pension should be granted in cases where service is partly as a sowar and partly as a Peishkar.

The scale of pension fixed for sowars is as follows:-

	Imperial	Local
After 20 years service.....	Rs.4/-	Rs.3/-
After 32 years service.....	Rs.5/-	Rs.5/-

It will be seen from the above scale that the amount of pension fixed for the sowars is almost

equal to that prescribed for an inferior servant in the Civil establishments where an Officer whose service has been for some time inferior and for some time superior counts the whole as inferior toward pension or gratuity on the inferior scale or the superior pension towards pension or gratuity on the Superior scale and the inferior pension towards gratuity on the inferior scale -vide article 258 of the Mysore Service Regulations- under that analogy it seems to me that the applicant in the present case is entitled to

	Yrs.	Mths.	Dys.
gratuity for the service of	13	10	25

rendered as Sowar under the Military rules and to pension for the service rendered as Peishkar under the Civil rules

I request that you will be so good as to obtain orders of Government on the subject and return the application for disposal.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

Comptroller.

Subd. to the 2nd Comm. for appt.

The case is novel, not being provided for in the existing rules.

Rd- 20/12/00
Mysore
861

19/12/00

Yes. Issue the draft

1900.

Read:-

Letter No. 3044 dated 19th November 00 from the Comptroller submitting for orders an application for pension on behalf of Rama Rao, late Peishcar in the Imperial Service Regt., received from the Chief Commandt. Mysore State Troops.

and endorsement thereon: D 611-12 Pro 855 dt 11/1901.

Rama Rao has put in a total service of 30-2-3 of which 13-10-25 were as a Sowar and 16-2-4 as a Peishcar, which is a civil appt attached to the Regiment, the former being regarded as Inferior and the latter as Superior. The Chief Commandant recommends him for a Superior pension treating the whole period of ~~Service~~ Rama Rao's service as Superior. But the Comptroller is of opinion that as neither the Rules prescribed for the Sowars Force nor those laid down for the civil employees

in the Injunc Service
Regs. differ as to the
amount of pension to be
granted in case of the
kind in question, the
applicant's case would
be dealt with in accordance
with the analogy of an Employee
case in the civil deptt
in which a portion of the Shore
Service was Superior and
a portion subordinate as pro
vided in art 258 of the
Rel. Regs. Such cases
in that opinion and
direct that Rama Rao's
case be regulated on
accordingly.

provide for

(1)

Offg AR 19/12/50

For Offg Secy

To
18/12/50
The Comptr. returning the
Pension appln.
The Chief Commdt, Injunc
State Troops.

Pens Copy
Issue 4/1/51.

Bm. 1274
1124

9822
1900 01

Transferred to the P & A Branch
2.3.01
Hrs.

RJ 5/3/01
Read 8/3.

(5)

(8)

No. 1709

Name of Petitioner Rama Rao
retired peishkar
6th Rizala
of the Imperial
Service Regiment

Village

Taluk

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 23. 2. 01

Date of Receipt 25. 2. 01

Date of Disposal Sl. (5)

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

States that during the regime
of the previous military Secret
to pension certificates were
ipned within 2 months after
was retired; that when people
retired during those days the
lot promotions of the remain
people some were made Sup
numeraries; that he was
on 5-9-99 on account of

r him to drag his existence during
se days of famine prices without
ny pension or allowance; that
hat he hears that for the 13 years
f his service as Siledar he is granted
ratuity + for 17 years Peishkary
ervice pension; that in the case of
agamballi Gurvrad who was retired on
.6.83 he was granted half-pay pension (17½ Rs pension)
ven though he was held, like him, two
ppointments; that though the Peishkari
ervice of Annaji Rao is not more than 15 yrs
yet he has been granted 17½ Rs-pension;
hat he is still able to work; that the
Medical Officer has not declared him
nfit; that with all this he has been
ebarred; That no rule making the
Siledari Service as superior Service
has been passed till now; that if the
laid rule had been passed he does not
now why the two persons mentioned
above were granted such pensions
why he should not get it; that
ven if the rule is in force it can
ave effect only to those who are
ewly appointed + not to those who
were appointed long ago;

4. + . . . was retired with h

(Subramanya)

1709

(5)

1709 DR

DATE 25-2-1901.

(10)

(11)

(12)

13

Pra. / 1398.

1273



FROM

E. R. SUBRAYER, ESQ.,

COMPTROLLER, GOVT. OF MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

GEN. & REV. DEPTS.

Dated 23

Despatched 29 March 1901

Received

General No. 1174

No. 642

Enclosure No. 1

SUBJECT.

Forwarding an application for Pension ~~of~~ (Gratuity) reported on for the orders of Government on behalf of Ramakka.

S 257
Read 9-4-01.



Fin.]

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF MYSORE.

No. 4114

Bangalore, 23 March 1901

From

E. R. SUBRAYER, Esq. B.A., B.C.E.,

COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE.

GENERAL & REVENUE DEPTS.

Sir,

I have the honor, with reference to Article 471 of the Mysore Service Regulations, to submit for the orders of Government, duly verified and reported on, the marginally noted application for ~~pension~~ gratuity received with ~~docket No.~~ correspondence ending with Bro. No. dated ~~from the~~ 8611-12 of 4th January 1901.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller.

Name and designation. | Class of Pension ~~or Gratuity~~. | Amount.

Ramaswamy, Peishkar, Imperial Treasury | Gratuity | Rs. 180 (Rupees one hundred and eighty only)

4 1901. (7)

Read:-

Govt. Pro. No. 8611-12
Pta 855-
of 4th January/01 directing
that the application for
pension on behalf of
Rama Rao, late Peishka
in the Imperial Service
Regiment, be reported
in accordance with art
258 of the Reg. Regulations.

(18)

(2). Letter No. 4114
Pta 642
of
23rd March/01 submitting
for orders duly verified
and vouched an
application for gratuity
and pension on behalf
of the said Rama Rao.

—"—

Order thereon: 14329-3P
Govt Pra 1346 D/ 25/4/1901.
The total period
of service rendered by
Rama Rao is 30-1-- (30-11-0),
of which 13-10-26 were
as a Killedar and 16-2-4

Sl (7)

as a Peishcar which is
a civil appointment
attached to the Regiment,
the former being regarded
as Inferior and the
latter as Superior, thereby
entitling him to gratuity
for the former and
a pension for the latter
service under art 268
Sikh Reg. Regs. Govt
are accordingly pleased
to grant the payment
to him of an Inferior
gratuity of Rs 169/- and
a Superior Compensation
~~&~~ pension of Rs 9/13/10,
per mensem, with effect
from 5th September/99,
both the amounts of
gratuity and pension
being debited to 'General
Revenues'.

Offg
for Secretary 22/4/01

Wd/15/4/01

20 The Comptr with copy of
1st page of the gratuity & pension appl.
The Chief Commdt, Imperial State Troops

1901

To The Comptroller & Atty
Genl. of Ingore

Dated Bangalore 24 July/01

Do: 1230 / 64 (9)
R&L 67 SL (8)

Genl. Pro: Do: 14329-30
PWA 1346

(20)

dated 25 April/01 sanction-
ing as recommended by
the Comptroller the payment
to Ramaswamy Lake Peshkar
of the Imperial Service Regt.
of an Inferior gratuity of
Rs. 169 for his service as
Silledar and a Superior
pension of Rs. 9-13-10
for ~~the~~ service rendered
within
as Peshkar.

Adverting to the above
has the honor to forward
~~the~~ Petition Regd: Do: 2914
dated 27 June/01 from
Ramaswamy stating that
if his service as Silledar
be regarded as Superior
as was done in the case
of Sreenivasa Row and

and Annajee Row he will be entitled to half pay pension viz: Rs. 18-8-0 and to request that the Comptroller will be good enough to report as to how the present case differs from those of the individuals referred to by the Petitioner.

(21)

2. The Pension Roll of the Petitioner and those of Srinivasa Row and Annajee Row which latter were disposed of by Govt Rev: Do: 353-4 of 10 April 86 are herewith sent for reference and return.

By order

Sd/- 22/7/1901.
for Secretary

22/7/01

P&A-970

Put up please the previous references.

14-12-01

15721/901 ...

Put up complete reference

17/12 — ...

18/12/01

1498/901 ...

26-11-01 ...

21/12 Submit. May these two Petitions be transferred to Pay & A. Branch in order

21.12.01 ... but there are certain points in the petition which can be dealt with only in the Military Dept.

23/12/01

22

1900

No. 1498 8452 8-1-02

Name of Petitioner Rama Rao. retired peishkar

Village 6 te Risale Impe Service Regi

Taluk

District

Date of Arzi 5.12.01

Date of Receipt 5.12.01.

Date of Disposal Sl (9)

No. of Enclosure ~~1~~ one

ABSTRACT

This amounts to an appeal against the order of the Military Asst dated 16-5-00 which is as follows "Petr is informed that as far as can be ascertained from the points referred to in his letter, he has no grounds for complaint. There is no rule compelling Govt to give Sawars 3 months notice before returning them, nor is there any rule obliging Govt to give leave before retirement. The petr's service entitles him to a certain pension which he has been granted. He has been selected for retirement in

reference to other men because in the opinion of one qualified to judge he is less fit for retention than those others. Govt See no reason for interfering in his case."

Petr states that he has been given a pension of Rs 9-13-0 instead of Rs 18-8-0, at his services as Siladari had been treated as inferior while there are instances that such services were treated as superior, that his juniors and new men were entertained as peishkars in preference to petr.

Prays (1) that he may be given full pension of Rs 18-8-0; 2) or that he may be reinstated as peishkar by conferring on him one of the peishkari posts now vacant in the Local Service Regiment

14-12-01

1798

To

P. N. KRISHNAMURTI ESQR. C. I. E.

Dewan of Mysore,

BANGALORE.

Respectfully Sheweth.

The petitioner served as a writer according to the new proceedings issued in the year 1599. When accordingly the designations of Peshkar and Sir Peshkar were changed into writer, the petitioner was given to understand that the said ranks of Peshkar, Sir Peshkar were reduced and was retired on pension all of a sudden on the 5th September 1899 without previous notice as per rules in force.

At the time of my retirement there were two Peshkarees vacant without being filled up under the Proceedings of the Dewan. If I had been appointed to the vacant place according to the reduction rules, there would have been no loss to the Government.

The said Peshkarees were otherwise filled up, Mr. Mahomed Hayath having been appointed to the Peshkaree of the Imperial Service Regiment and another Mr. Venkata Row or to that of the Local Service Regiment.

The petitioner was retired in the month of September 1899 and Mr. Venkata Row's appointment took place in the month of November 1899. This Peshkaree was kept vacant for one year prior to his retirement.

Peshkar Mr. Subbaramiah who was retired along with the petitioner, complained that his superior service will entitle him to less than half the pension in case his infirior service is deducted; whereupon he was entertained as a supernumerary.

Your honor will kindly consider whether it is not a violation of the rules to have retired a fit man like the petitioner (who has rendered 30 years' service to the State and is aged 50 years), to have entertained Mr. Subbramiah as a Supernumerary and to have enlisted the services of novices like Messrs. Mahomed Hyath and Venkata Rao.

The petitioner has herein enclosed an endorsement No. 2171 passed by the Military Assistant on his petition to him regarding the above circumstances. It runs as follows:—

I. That the petitioner has no grounds for complaint.

II. That there is no rule obliging the Government to give leave before retirement.

III. That there is no reason for interfering in the case of the petitioner.

The petition that I made is not to be regarded as a complaint but as a request to act justly in my case.

From December 1898 up to 1900 many Sawars such as Daffedars, Jamadars, Resaldars &c, were retired with previous notices and after privilege leave.

Resaldar Mr. Syed Abdul Rahiman had 3 months' previous notice and leave, besides a bonus amounting to 3 months' pay before retirement.

The above concessions were only granted under the support of rules. All these are borne out by records.

The petitioner was not a Sawar like others. He had belonged to the rank of a Peshkar. As such, he was carrying on the business of a writer. His services relate to uncovenanted rules. He should have been served with a previous notice. He was abruptly retired. He, as a forlorn suppliant, prays that the Government may be pleased to peruse the correspondence that has transpired between the Chief Cammandant and Military Assistant with reference to his retirement.

The Petitioner was retired 20 months ago. Since then, he is sufferring from want of a living. He made several petitions to the Chief Commandant, Military Assistant and Comptroller requesting order for payment of advance to him and it was not listened to. That the petitioner is to get a grant of Rs. 160 for inferior service of Siledari performed for 14 years and a pension of Rs. 9—13—10 per mensem in consideration of service rendered as **as a Peishkar during a period of 16 years.**

The petitioner in justice, is entitled to a pension of Rs. 18—8—0. In liew of this he understands that only Rs. 9—13—10 has been sanctioned. He therefore begs that his case may be impartially dealt with.

Since the introduction of pension rules into the Sawar Dept. Siladari is being treated as a superior service and pensions are granted accordingly; it was only in the case of the petitioner that Siladari service was deducted as inferior service.

Mr. Peishkar Harohally Annaji Rao served as a Siledar for 20 years and as a Peishkar for 8 years. He has been now drawing a pension of Rs. 17—8—0. There are many instances in which Siledari service is counted for superior pension.

Under fresh Proceedings of 1899, the following officials are drawing their pensions equal to moity of their salaries as shown under :—

	Pay Rs.	Pension Rs.
Mr. Risaldar Abdul Rahiman	180	... 90.
„ Jamadar Syed Sultan	80	... 40.
„ Risaldar Chithamber Rao Morai ...	140	... 70.
„ Do Abdul Rahiman	100	... 50.
„ Jamadar Syed Budden ...	80	... 40.

These individuals, like the petitioner served as Siledars for several years. The several Jamadars, Risaldars &c. who were retired between the years 92 and 99 were drawing pensions under the rules then existing. The same officials had their pensions enhanced with effect from March 1899 as per Proceedings issued in that month.

The petitioner, under these circumstances begs the generous Government will dispose of his case with even handedness.

The petitioner claims Superior pension for the Service of Siledari in the same way as the others, mentioned above, did for the like service.

He further prays that a bonus amounting to three months' pay as per the recommendation of the Chief Commandant and a pension of Rs. 18—8—0 may be granted to him. In the alternative he may be appointed to the rank of Peishkar in the room of one of the men newly enlisted in contravention of the rules.

If this cannot be done, the petitioner begs to state that since 4 Peishkars have been retired in the Local Service Regiment and one of these vacant Peishkarees has recently been filled up by Supernumerary Subramiah thus leaving 3 posts vacant, the humble Petitioner may be kindly granted one of these three vacancies.

To this effect the petitioner most humbly craves the benignity of the honored Government and remains their,

Bangalore
8-12-1901

Most obedient and humble Servant.

V. B. Soobbiah & Sons, Bangalore—1901.

To

THE MILITARY ASSISTANT,

to the Government of Mysore,

BANGALORE.

(27)

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH.

Petition of Rama Row, 6th Risale Peiskar Imperial Service Regiment.

The petitioner was retired on pension on the 5th September 1899 as the rank of the Peishkars was reduced in the new scale.

Risaldars, Daffadars, Silediars &c, had notice of retirement given and leave granted preparatory to retirement; but in the individual case of the petitioner this was not done.

The Regiment Commanding Officer communicated an order that the Government have refused to grant bonus or leave.

It is surprising that the petitioner should be deprived of the advantage of the said notice and leave while all the rest were allowed the privilege.

It is two years since the Dewan has passed the circular orders directing that all the ranks that may become vacant in the Regiments should not be filled up until further orders. Since the date of this order all the ranks were kept in abeyance. There were two or three vacancies among the ranks of Peishkari.

According to the reduction rules such of the Sir Peishkars and Peishkars as had served less than 5 years should have been reverted to their former appointments and it would have been at the same time consistent with the rules to have appointed me to one of the vacant ranks. This was not done. This arrangement has deprived me of the only means of living and reduced me to a state of beggary. The Government has also sustained loss by retiring strong and capable men on pensions.

Venkata Row was appointed to Peshkari which was vacant in the Local Regiment; Mr. Mahamed Hyath, a School master, was provided with a Peishkari vacant in the Imperial Service Regiment. Krishna Row and Sama Row writers each on Rs 15 were promoted to the posts of Squadron writers on Rs 31.

Reduction is an item of savings to the Government. Incompetent and obstinate persons should be made fit subjects for retirement. It was not done so. Those of Peshkari rank whose service was less than 5 years should have been reverted to their former appointments allowing the petitioner to fill up a post in the ranks under the reduction rules. This was not done either. The petitioner was retired on pension under the pretence of effecting reduction. The four vacancies that had existed were filled up by a school master on Rs 15 and three others on increase of pay. Their service varies from 2 to 4 years. They are fit to be brought under reduction under the rules in the very first instance. Under the Dewan's proceedings the petitioner was not declared unfit in medical examination; nor has he completed his 55th or 60th year. Inspite of this he was retired. The petitioner requests that the Government may throw out newly enlisted men and employ the petitioner in place of one of them after making a personal enquiry into their fitness or otherwise for duty.

The petitioner's grand-father by name Venkata Row was a Regimentdar. Another grand-father of his by name Yeavanta Row was a Risaldar. His father called Senkara Row was a Jamadar. He (petitioner) was serving as a Siledar for a period of 10 or 12 years during the time of Colonel Stewart. Having regard to petitioner's high parentage, and the reputation they have earned in the fighting, Mr. Travers favored him with an appointment of Peishkari.

Colonel Stewart, Colonel Travers and Colonel Hay protected people by their impartial Justice. You now occupy their dignity of position. The petitioner craves impartial treatment at your hands and prays that he may be re-entertained in Service.

Endoresment granted by the Military Assistant on the 16th May 1900.

No. 2171 dated 16th May 1900.

Petitioner is informed that as far as can be ascertained from the points set forth in his letter he has no grounds for complaint.

e. g. There is no rule compelling Government to give Sowars 3 months' notice before retiring them.

Nor is there any rule obliging Government to give leave before retirement.

The petitioner's service entitles him to a certain pension which he has been granted. He has been selected for retirement in preference to other men because in the opinion of those qualified to judge he is less fit for retention than those others.

Government see therefore no reason for interfering in his case.

BANGALORE,
15th May 1900.

R. G. JONES, MAJOR.
Military Assistant.

V. B. Soobbiah & Sons, Bangalore—1901.

OFFICE OF
10395
10 FEB. 02

P&A - 1154

1056

DEPARTMENT

189

From

The Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Rev. & Agl Dept.

Dated 4 February

Despatched

Received

No. 5126 Sl (10)

No. 463

SUBJECT MATTER.

With reference to his
1230/67 of 24th July o.

Stating that the petitioners
case did not differ
from those of Peerkan
Shamiraya Rao & Annaji
Rao which have reported
on by this Office in which

Recd 18.2.02.

Sent with a note Contr

14/2/02

Secret & Political DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER, MYSORE GOVT.

Bangalore, 6th February 1902.

From

E. R. SUBRAYER, Esq.,

Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Secret & Rev. Dept.

Sir,

In reference to your docket No. 1230 of the 24th ult. forwarding a petition from Peishkar Srinivasa Rao, late Peishkar, Bowring Regiment, for grant of pension and requesting to be informed by Government whether the petitioner's case did not differ from those of Peishkar, Srinivasa Rao and Anna Rao, which were reported on by this office in March/81, and if so, whether this office felt a doubt as to the propriety of dealing with the case of the petitioner Ranga Rao which necessitated a reference being made to Government (vide this office letter No. 3044 of the 19th November last) which concurred

the views expressed by this office and passed orders accordingly in proceedings no 8611-12/855 of 6 January 1901.

A copy of this office letter was at the same time forwarded to the Chief Commandant who made no protest against the proposed alteration in the method of computing pension for Sowar Forces.

(31)

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedient servant

Comptroller.

Office of the Mysore Imperial
Service Regiment
16th April 1902

This is to certify that the pay of retired Peishkar Rama Rao of T. troop, has been drawn and disbursed till 24th September 1899, at Rs 37-0-0 per mensem.

32

Syed Hafeez Regimentdar
Commandant
Imp: Serv: Regt.

C
Vol 17 9/00

Memo: No. 556

In the Barrawond received in August 1857, it is entered that the applicant has been entertained as Silledar on the 15th of that month. But to verify his service from that date, no individual details are given in the Barrawonds received upto 31st March 1863.

R. Rivaz
15/12/65 Undersecretary

To Comptroller Jayanagar.

6505. Memo. No. 8
259.

Forwarded to the Dewan's Office for verification of applicant's services upto 1863.

A. Jaganmohan
Asst. Comptroller

CRB
11/12/65

12/12

Application for Pension or Gratuity. Petition

Date of application. 5th June 1865.

Name of applicant. Shivaji Rao

Last appointment. Silledar

Class of pension or gratuity. Commutation Pension

Amount of pension sanctioned.

Amount of gratuity sanctioned. Nil

Date of commencement. 15th June 1857.

Date of sanction.

33

Mysore Govt. Press, Bangalore 15-1-83.—1,500

(Finl. Serial No. 104.)

Application for Pension or Gratuity.

1. Name of Applicant.
2. Father's Name.
3. Sect or Caste.
4. Residence.
5. Present or last employment including name of Establishment.
6. Date of beginning of service.
7. Date of end of service.
8. Length of service including breaks—

   of which superior

   inferior

   Non-qualifying and breaks

9. Class of pension or gratuity applied for, and cause of application *
10. (Average) emoluments or pay.
11. Proposed pension.
12. Proposed gratuity.
13. Date from which to commence.
14. Place of payment.
15. Date of Applicant's birth by Christian era.†
16. Height.
17. Marks.
18. Date.

* If the application is for a compensation pension or gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

† (If not known exactly must be stated on the best information or estimate.)

History of the Service (shewing breaks) of [illegible]

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay.	Acting Allowance.	Date of Beginning.	Date of End.	Period reckoned as Service.	Period not reckoned as Service.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by Comptroller.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	"	[illegible]	[illegible]	8-3-6				Service from 15th Aug. 1874 to 14th June 1882 admitted in the receipt of the Auditor Genl. as certified under column 10 of this page & counterchecked as well as Length from which deduction is made. J. Bates Accountant in this Office.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	"	[illegible]	[illegible]	1-2-19				
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	"	[illegible]	[illegible]	1-7-2		Leave deducted during which period are Rs. 5-66-6-8		
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	"	[illegible]	[illegible]	10-11-21				
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	"	[illegible]	[illegible]	5-2-14				
						26-3-2	1-7-2			

Remarks by Head of Office.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant.

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation.

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant, See Ch: XX.

4. Explanation under Section 59, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it.

5. Any other Remarks.

6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not (See Rule 6, under Section 84.)

Signature.

Certificate and Report of ~~Deputy~~ Comptroller.

Certified that (subject to the remarks below recorded) qualifying service in Superior grades have been duly proved for Twenty one years ten months ~~days;~~ and that a pension not exceeding Rupees 17-8-- Seventeen & annas eight only is admissable under Section of the Civil Pension Code. The calculations have been duly verified. The pension ~~is chargeable to~~ is calculated at half of Rs. 35/ the average annual emoluments drawn during the last five years of service

Comptroller's Office,
Bangalore, 26th March 1886

Comptroller Mysore.

A.G.G.

OFFICE Income 8632 DEPARTMENT 237 0

Forwarded to the Dewan's Office for verification of applicant's services rendered upto 1863.

Adlingaswamy
Asst. Comptroller

C.C.H.
9/3/86.

11-3-86

Memo: No 462

Returned duly verified as per statement attached.

P. Narasaiya
Undersecretary
17/3/86

Application for Pension or Gratuity. Pension

Date of application. 5th June 1885

Name of applicant. Gnegonde Sreenivas Rows

Last appointment. Sub Raidroog

Class of pension or gratuity. Compensation Pension

Amount of pension sanctioned. }

Amount of gratuity sanctioned. } Nil

Date of commencement. 15th June 1885.

Date of sanction.

Mysore Govt. Press, Bangalore 15-1-83.—1,500.

(Fml. Serial No. 104.)

Application for Pension or Gratuity.

1. Name of Applicant. -
2. Father's Name. -
3. Sect or Caste.
4. Residence
5. Present or last employment including name of Establishment.
6. Date of beginning of service. [22]
7. Date of end of service. [50]
8. Length of service including breaks— Yrs. M. D.

   ——— 27 - 11 - [illegible]

   of which superior ——— 27 - 11 - [illegible]

   inferior ——— - - -

   Non-qualifying and breaks ——— - - -
9. Class of pension or gratuity applied for, and cause of application * Compensation [illegible]
10. (Average) emoluments or pay. -
11. Proposed pension. Eighteen annas monthly and [illegible]
12. Proposed gratuity. ———
13. Date from which to commence.
14. Place of payment.
15. Date of Applicant's birth by Christian era.†
16. Height.
17. Marks.
18. Date.

[illegible]
Secretary

Signature of Head of Office.

* If the application is for a compensation pension or gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

† (If not known exactly must be stated on the best information or estimate.)

Statement of Services of Anagondi Srinivas Rao, Sur Pesskar, Sawar Establishment; according to the Huzur accounts.

Office	Designation	Pay	From: Commencement of Service	From: From what accounts	To: Termination of Service	To: From what accounts	Total period of Service: Permanent	Total period of Service: Temporary or Acting
Sawar Establishment	Silladar	20 . .	15-7-57	Baraward	31-7-61	Baraward	4 . 1½	
do	Pesskar	30 . .	1-8-61	do	31-3-63	do	1 8 .	
						Total-	5 8 1½	. . .

Mysore Dewan's Office
Bangalore 17th March 1886

B. Suryanarayan
Offg Under Secretary

27-7-17
5-14



11-14 @ 40 = 938-10-8

" -16 @ 35 = 12-8-10-8

5 " -"

60 | 2.217-5-4 | 36-15-8

180

417

360

57 16

917

900

17 12

308

300

8

23 40

920

36 35

180

108

1.260

History of the Service (shewing breaks) of Mr Faichear J. Edwards R.C.S.

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay.	Acting Allowance.	Date of Beginning.	Date of End.	Period reckoned as Service.	Period not reckoned as Service.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by Comptroller.
Coast Establishment	Sub Collector	20 ✓	"	25th July 1857	31st July 61	4-0-17 ✓	"	Has had no other leave. Has forfeited leave during this period of service.	Copy of Certificate ✓	
Do Do	Collector	30 ✓	"	1st August 1861	31st May 67	5-10-0 ✓	"			
Do Do	Do	35 ✓	"	1st June 1867	30th June 83	16-1-0 ✓	"			
Do Do	Chief Collector	40 ✓	"	1st July 1883	14th June 1885	1-11-14 ✓	"			
				Total Period of Service		27-11-28 ✓				

Remarks by Head of Office.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant.

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation.

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant, See Ch: XX.

4. Explanation under Section 59, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it.

5. Any other Remarks. —

6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not (See Rule 6, under Section 84.)

Signature.

Certificate and Report of ~~Deputy~~ Comptroller.

Certified that (subject to the remarks below recorded) qualifying service in Superior grades have been duly proved for seventeen years eleven months ~~days~~; and that a ~~pension~~ not exceeding Rupees 18-7-7 Eighteen ; is admissable under Section 113 of the Civil Pension Code. The calculations have been duly verified. The pension has been ~~is chargeable to~~ half of Rs 36-15-3 the average emoluments drawn during the last five years of service.

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Bangalore, 26th March 1886

Comptroller Mysore.

Finl. 104.]

APPLICATION FOR PENSION ~~OR GRATUITY~~ (corrected in the Accountant General's Office)

1. Name of applicant— Ramia Row

2. Father's name— Senkhara Rao

3. Race, sect and caste— Smartha Deshastha Brahmin

Residence— Mysore

(42)

5. Present or last employment, including name of establishment— Peishcar, Imperial Service Regiment

6. Date of beginning of service— 6th August 1869 (20)

7. Date of ending of service— 4th September 1899 (50) Y. M. D.
(as per L. P. C attached)

8. Length of service, including interruptions ... ... 30 - 1 - 4

of which Superior ... ... 30 - 1 - 4

Inferior ... ... " - " - "

Non-qualifying and interruptions ... ... " - " - "

9. Class of Pension or Gratuity applied for, and cause of application*— Compensation pension (Retr
in Consequence of the reduction in the strength of the R

10. (Average) emoluments or pay— Rupees 37 - 0 - 4½ 13

11. Proposed Pension— Rupees 18-8-0 (Eighteen and annas Eight Only).
9-13-10

12. Proposed Gratuity— Nil 169-0-0

13. Date from which Pension is to commence— 5th September 1899

14. Place of payment— Bangalore District Treasury

15. Date of applicant's birth by Christian era†— 1st August 1849 (By his own Statement).

16. Height— 5 feet 1/4 Inch.

17. Marks— A large raised black mole in front of right thigh
A circular Scar in the middle of right thigh.

18. Date—

J Bswapke

Signature of Head of Office.

Chief Clerk

* If the application is for a Compensation, Pension or Gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

† If not known exactly, must be stated on the best information or estimate.

History of the Service (showing interruption) of Pikihear Rama Rau.

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of beginning	Date of ending.	Period reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Period not reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by Comptroller.
Late 5th Regiment	Sillidar	26/-	"	6th August 1869	30th June 1883	13	10	26	"	"	"		Town Police Records	
Late 1st Regiment, 2nd Troop & now Imperial Service Regiment	Peishcar	35/-	"	1st July 1883	31st March 1892	8	9	"	"	"	"			
Imperial Service	Do	37/		1st April 1892	3rd September 1899	7	5	4	"	"	"			
						30	1	4	"	"	"			

Total period of Superior (or Inferior) Service

Application for Pension or Gratuity.

5720

Date of application ... ...

Name of applicant ... ...

Last appointment ... ...

Gratuity ... .

Amount of Pension sanctioned ... ...

Amount of Gratuity sanctioned ... .

Date of commencement ... .

Date of sanction ... ...

Remarks by Head of Office.

1. As to character and past conduct of applicant ... Good

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation ... Nil

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by applicant (see Chapter XIX). Nil

4. Explanation under Article 279 so far as the Head of the Office can give it. Nil

5. Any other remarks ... ... Nil

6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not [see Article 472 (*b*).] Service Established and Should be admitted.

J Desmyth

Signature.

Certificate and Report of Comptroller.

Certified that ~~(subject to the remarks below recorded)~~ qualifying service in ~~inferior~~ superior grades has been duly proved for 30 years, 1 months, ~~1~~ 0 days; and that a ~~Superior Com~~ Pension (~~or Gratuity~~) not exceeding Rs. (9-13-10 Pm. & Rs. 169-- ~~one~~ Rupees Nine annas thirteen & pies ten) (One hundred & sixty nine only) admissible under Article 258 & 32(b) of the Mysore Service Regulations. The calculations have been duly verified. The Pension (~~or Gratuity~~) is chargeable to General Revenues, and has been computed at 16 ths of average emoluments drawn during the last five years of service. Rs. 37½ for the Superior service of 16-2-4 and half months pay last drawn Rs. 26/ when in Superior service for each completed year of the Superior service of 13-10-26 as per Govt Pro. No. 8641-12 & 4th Jany 1901. R.F.A. 855

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Bangalore, the ~~17th Sept. 1899~~
15th March 1901.

M Eagles
Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

~~Attention is invited to Article 317 (a) of the Regulations.~~

(15)

To

The Chief Commandant
Mysore State Troops.
Bangalore

No. 16 168 / Pkt. 1138 / Sl. (11)

Dy. 1-4-02 ~~March~~ 1902

In forwarding herewith Petition Registered No. 2914 d: 27th June 1901 from Rama Row Pensioned ~~Peishkar~~ Peishkar praying that his service as Silledar may be treated as Superior as was done in the cases of Srinivasa Row and Annaji Row and an enhanced pension may be given to him, has the honour to request that the Chief Commandant will be good enough to report the rules under which the Services of ~~as~~ Silledars were treated as Superior and a half pension calculated on the average emoluments of the last five years of Service was recommended on

(45)

× Vide Govt. Pro. No. 353-4 & 6 10th April 1886.

on behalf of Srinivasa Rao and Annaji Rao referred to, by the Petrs in the late Military Secy's ~~letter~~ D.O. No. 1590 d: 31st March 1886, and the modifications, if any, which those rules have undergone subsequent to that date

B. O.

Draft JD 29/3/1902
Sr Secretary

JD 28/3/02

(46)

Mr Gupta
Should have
been made
over to the
Military Dept
when Mr
Chatterjee
was over &
read? What
was the final
decision

WHS
27.VII.02

17

201. 1709 1902 AUG 1902 1/A 210

(17)

FROM Lieut. Colonel J. Delaney C
Chief Commandant
Mysore State Force

To H. C. Channaiyya Esqre, M
Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
General and Revenue Depts

Dated 12th
Despatched 14th August
Received
General No. 387 SL (12)
No.

(47)

Enclosure No. —

Quoting instances in which the Services of certain Silledars were counted as qualifying Service for Half pay pension

To Records

Please put up Govt Pro: with papers
No. 5644-5 d: 9th Jany 1886 regarding
93
to withdraw
28/8/93

MGCPB—3-3-01—50 reams.

Regiment	Rank	Name	Authority
1st	Peishcar	Guru Row	Proceedings of Government No.5644-5/93 dated 9th January 1886.
3rd	Surpeishcar	Hanumantha Row	---------- Do ----------
1st	--- Do ----	A.Srinivasa Row	---------- Do ---------- 353-4/6 dated 10th April 1886.
1st	Peishcar	Annaji Row	----------Do ----------

MYSORE STATE TROOPS
OFFICE
OF
THE CHIEF COMMANDANT.

No: 387

(17)

Bangalore 12th/14th August 1902.

From,

Lt.Col J.Desaraj Urs,

Chief Commandant, Mysore State Troops

To,

H.V.Nanjundayya Esquire, M.A., M.L.,

Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore

(48) General & Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No.16168/P&a 1138 of the 1st April last, I have the honor to inform you that there have been a few precedents (vide margin) of the services of silledars being treated as superior (their pay being above ₹ 10/-) and of half pay pension calculated on the average emoluments of the last five years of service; but there is no express rule on the subject, and this practice had not undergone any modifications, until pensioned Peishcar Rama Row's case was decided by Government in Proceedings No.14329-30/ P&a 1346 dated 25th April 1907.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

J Desaraj Urs

LT. COLONEL.

Chief Commandant,
Mysore State Troops.

No. 9073 Sl (13)
PA. 637
D/ 27/11/02.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
P&A.
~~PETITION~~ DEPARTMENT,

The November 1902

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO. Ram Rao late Resident Regiment of the Mysore Horse, Bangalore the Imperial Service

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2914 dated 26th June 190 and subsequent petitions praying that his service as Sille may be treated as superior and an enhanced pension sanctioned to him in lieu of the pension and gratuity sanct in Govt Proceedings No 14329-30 P&A. 1346 of 25th April 1901

Petitioner is informed that the orders already passe in his case in Govt Pros No 8611-12 P&A. 855 of 4th January 19 and No 14329-30 P&A. 1346 of 25th April 1901, are final a ~~decision to reopen his case will be~~

49

By Order,

DK

27/11/1902
for Secretary

DRP
21-11-02